

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-34 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-34 are rejected. Claims 1, 13-15, 27-31, 33 and 34 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 8-10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 5,983,073 by Ditzik, hereinafter referred to as the "Ditzik" reference. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3, 8-10 and 13 is not anticipated by Ditzik.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A system of electronic devices comprising:
a first device residing in a first housing, said first device comprising a microphone and a speaker; and
a second device residing in a second housing, said second device comprising a processor, a memory unit coupled to said processor, electronics for wireless communications coupled to said processor, a first display coupled to said processor, and a telephony chipset for providing telephony functionality, said second housing comprising a connection means for removably connecting said first device to said second device, said connection means integrated directly into said second housing;
wherein said first device is communicatively coupled by a wireless connection to said second device and wherein said first

device and said second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using said telephony chipset of said second device.

Claims 3, 8-10, and 13 that depend from independent Claim 1 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Ditzik to teach a modular notebook and/or PDA. In particular, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a module for storing a wireless handset. In particular, the computer system does not include telephony functionality. Moreover, the module for storing the wireless handset is not integrated directly into the housing of the computer system, but rather is a separate module.

Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed.

With reference to Figure 2 of Ditzik, a portable computer system with several detached or disassembled parts is shown (col. 5, lines 7-8).

Specifically, flat panel display assembly 2, cover section 8, cover section 9, and

wireless handset 14 of the portable computer system are each comprised within separate and individual housings (col. 3, line 56 through col. 4, line 17). Cover section 8 includes a cutout 34 (element 35 [sic] as shown in Figure 2) for storing wireless handset 14 (col. 5, lines 52-67). Applicants respectfully assert that cover section 8 is not directly integrated into flat panel display assembly 2. In contrast, cover section 8 is a separate module with a separate housing from flat panel display assembly 2.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. With reference to Figure 2 of Ditzik, Applicants understand wireless handset 14 to be a fully functioning cellular telephone capable of providing voice communication without the use of electronic componentry of another part of the computer system (col. 5, lines 55-59 and col. 8, lines 19-22). Specifically, flat panel display assembly 2 does not include a telephony chipset. Since flat panel display assembly 2 does not include any electronic componentry for providing wireless communication, wireless handset 14 and flat panel display assembly 2 are not operable to work in combination for providing wireless communication using a telephony chipset of flat panel display assembly 2. In particular, flat panel display assembly 2 is not operable to provide any telephony functionality.

Applicants understand Ditzik to teach a modular computer system including a module for storing a wireless handset. Applicants respectfully assert that this module is not directly integrated into the flat panel display assembly. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein a first device including a speaker and a microphone and a second device including a telephony chipset work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephone chipset of the second device, as claimed.

In contrast, embodiments of the claimed invention are directed towards a system of electronic devices that work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices. A first device (e.g., a handset) in a first housing includes a microphone and a speaker. A second device (e.g., a portable computer system) in a second housing includes a telephony chipset for providing telephony functionality to transmit and receive cellular communications. Moreover, the second housing includes an integrated connection means for removably connecting the first device to the second device.

With reference to the current specification, embodiments of the present invention provide a compact removable handset for use with an integrated

palmtop computer system/mobile phone. Specifically, embodiments of the present invention provide two electronic devices, where one electronic device includes a connection means for removably connecting the two electronic devices. For example, with reference to Figure 4A of the present application, palmtop computer system/cellular phone 405 includes receiving port 415 for receiving compact removable handset 410. In particular, receiving port 415 is directly integrated into the housing of palmtop computer system/cellular phone 405 (page 17, lines 15-23). Figures 4B, 4C, 5A and 5B illustrate further examples.

Furthermore, embodiments of the present invention provide that the handset and the palmtop computer system work in combination to provide wireless communications (page 4, lines 15-20). With reference to Figure 1, a block diagram of components of computer system 100, in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, is shown. Voice handset transmitter/receiver 112 provides a communication link between computer system 100 and a voice handset, such as voice handset 200 of Figure 2A (page 10, lines 13-20).

In order to provide a compact device, the voice handset does not include all electronic componentry to provide wireless communications. Rather, the voice handset uses telephony circuitry (e.g., telephony chipset 111 of Figure 1) to provide wireless communications. Accordingly, the claimed embodiments

provide an integrated portable computer system/mobile phone that provides for mobile phone functionality while maintaining the compact size of a portable computer system.

Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik in particular does not teach, disclose, or suggest the invention as claimed. In contrast, Ditzik discloses a modular computer system including a module for storing a wireless handset, in which the module is not directly integrated into the housing of the computer system. Moreover, since the computer system does not include any telephony functionality, the wireless handset and the computer system do not work in combination to provide wireless communications using a telephony chipset of the computer system, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Ditzik teach, disclose or suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, and that this claim overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and is in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Ditzik also does not teach, disclose or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 8-10 and 13 that are dependent on allowable base Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 8-10 and 13 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 4, 15-19, 23, 24, 27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, in view of United States Patent 6,014,573 by Lehtonen, hereinafter referred to as the "Lehtonen" reference. Claims 2 and 4 depend from independent Claim 1. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 4, 15-19, 23, 24, 27 and 29 are not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen in view of the following rationale.

Independent Claims 15 and 29 recite similar limitations to independent Claim 1. Claims 2 and 4 that depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 16-19, 23, 24 and 27 that depend from independent Claim 15 provide further recitations of features of the present invention.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and

the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Lehtonen does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Lehtonen, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset and wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Lehtonen to teach a double-acting communication device including a display. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second

housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in either Ditzik or Lehtonen, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 15 and 29 overcome the cited references and are therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2 and 4 that depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 16-19, 23, 24 and 27 that depend from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 4, 16-19, 23, 24 and 27 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik and Lehtonen, further in view of United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0002707 by Ekel et al., hereinafter referred to as

the “Ekel” reference. Claim 5 depends from independent Claim 1 and Claim 20 depends from independent Claim 15. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 5 and 20 are not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Ekel in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Lehtonen does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Lehtonen, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Lehtonen to teach a double-acting communication device including a display. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Furthermore, the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Ekel fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Ekel does not overcome the

shortcomings of Ditzik and Lehtonen. Ekel, alone or in combination with Ditzik and Lehtonen, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset and Lehtonen teaches a double-acting communication device including a display.

Applicants understand Ekel to teach a remote controller for displaying information regarding volume. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Ekel does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ekel does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in Ditzik, Lehtonen, or Ekel, either alone or in combination, in

combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 15 overcome the cited references and are therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Ekel. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Ekel also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 5 that depends from independent Claim 1 and Claim 20 that depends from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5 and 20 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, in view of United States Patent 6,622,018 by Erikson, hereinafter referred to as the "Erikson" reference. Claims 6 and 7 depend from independent Claim 1. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6 and 7 are not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik and Erikson in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a

second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Erikson fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Erikson does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Erikson, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Erikson to teach a portable device control console with a wireless connection. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Erikson does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic

devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Erikson does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in either Ditzik or Erikson, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik and Erikson. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik and Erikson also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 6 and 7 that depend from independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6 and 7 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik and Lehtonen, further in view of Erekson. Claims 21 and 22 depend from independent Claim 15. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 21 and 22 are not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Erekson in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Lehtonen does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Lehtonen, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset and wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Lehtonen to teach a double-acting communication device including a display. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Furthermore, the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Ereksen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Ereksen does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik and Lehtonen. Ereksen, alone or in combination with Ditzik and Lehtonen, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset and Lehtonen teaches a double-acting communication device including a display.

Applicants understand Ereksen to teach a portable device control console with a wireless connection. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Ereksen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ereksen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in Ditzik, Lehtonen, or Erikson, either alone or in combination, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 15 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Erikson. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Erikson also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 21 and 22 that depend from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21 and 22 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, in view of United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0208113 by Mault et al., hereinafter referred to as the "Mault" reference. Claims 11 and 12 depend from independent Claim 1. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 11 and 12 are not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik and Mault in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing

and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Mault fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Mault does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Mault, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Mault to teach a closed loop glycemic index system. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Mault does not teach,

describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Mault does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in either Ditzik or Mault, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik and Mault. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik and Mault also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 11 and 12 that depend from independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11 and 12 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik and Lehtonen, further in view of Mault. Claims 25 and 26 depend from independent Claim 15. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 25 and 26 are not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Mault in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Lehtonen does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Lehtonen, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Lehtonen to teach a double-acting communication device including a display. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Furthermore, the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Mault fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Mault does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik and Lehtonen. Mault, alone or in combination with Ditzik and Lehtonen, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset and Lehtonen teaches a double-acting communication device including a display.

Applicants understand Mault to teach a closed loop glycemic index system. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Mault does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Mault does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in Ditzik, Lehtonen, or Mault, either alone or in combination, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 15 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Mault. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Mault also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 25 and 26 that depend from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25 and 26 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, in view of United States Patent Application Publication 2002/0166127 by Hamano et al., hereinafter referred to as the "Hamano" reference. Claim 14 depends from independent Claim 1. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 14 is not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik and Hamano in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing

and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Hamano fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Hamano does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Hamano, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Hamano to teach a system for providing advertisements in a wireless terminal. Specifically, Applicants respectfully

assert that Hamano does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Hamano does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in either Ditzik or Hamano, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik and Hamano. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik and Hamano also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 14 that depends from independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and is in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik and Lehtonen, further in view of Hamano. Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 15. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 28 is not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Hamano in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and including a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and comprising a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices, using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Lehtonen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Lehtonen does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Lehtonen, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Lehtonen to teach a double-acting communication device including a display. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Furthermore, the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Hamano fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Hamano does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik and Lehtonen. Hamano, alone or in combination with Ditzik and Lehtonen, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset and Lehtonen teaches a double-acting communication device including a display.

Applicants understand Hamano to teach a system for providing advertisements in a wireless terminal. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Hamano does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices including a first device residing in a first housing and comprising a microphone and a speaker, and a second device residing in a second housing and including a telephony chipset, wherein the second housing comprises a connection means directly integrated into the second housing for removably connecting the first device to the second device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Hamano does not teach, describe or suggest a system of electronic devices wherein the first device and the second device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using a telephony chipset of the second device, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in Ditzik, Lehtonen, or Hamano, either alone or in combination, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 15 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Hamano. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik, Lehtonen and Hamano also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 28 that depends from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 28 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and is in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, in view of United States Patent 6,333,973 by Smith et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Smith” reference, and further in view of United States Patent 6,741,870 by Holmström et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Holmström” reference. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 30-33 are not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik, Smith and Holmström in view of the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 30 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A portable electronic device comprising:
a portable computer system residing in a portable computer system housing and comprising:
a processor coupled to a bus;
a memory coupled to said bus for containing database applications and database information;
a display unit coupled to said bus for displaying portions of said database information;
a first wireless transceiver unit coupled to said bus;
and
a wireless telephone communication device coupled to said bus; and
a communication device residing in a communication device housing and removably attachable directly to said portable computer system housing and comprising:
a second wireless transceiver for communicating with said first wireless transceiver;
a microphone;
a speaker; and
a second display unit for displaying a portion of said database information thereon and for facilitating an automatic dialing process, based on user input, using said wireless telephone communication device of said portable computer system.

Claims 31-33 that depend from independent Claim 30 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Ditzik to teach a modular notebook and/or PDA. In particular, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a module for storing a wireless handset

wherein the computer system does not include telephony functionality.

Moreover, the module for storing the wireless handset is not integrated directly into the housing of the computer system, but rather is a separate module.

Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device including a portable computer system and a communication device wherein the computer system includes a wireless telephone communication device, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein a communication device and a portable computer device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephony chipset of the portable computer device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein the communication device resides in a communication device housing and is removably attachable directly to a portable computer system housing, as claimed.

With reference to Figure 2 of Ditzik, a portable computer system with several detached or disassembled parts is shown (col. 5, lines 7-8). Specifically, flat panel display assembly 2, cover section 8, cover section 9, and wireless handset 14 of the portable computer system are each comprised within separate and individual housings (col. 3, line 56 through col. 4, line 17).

Cover section 8 includes a cutout 34 (element 35 [sic] as shown in Figure 2) for storing wireless handset 14 (col. 5, lines 52-67). Applicants respectfully assert that cover section 8 is not directly integrated into flat panel display assembly 2. In contrast, cover section 8 is a separate module with a separate housing from flat panel display assembly 2.

Moreover, still with reference to Figure 2 of Ditzik, Applicants understand wireless handset 14 to be a fully functioning cellular telephone capable of providing voice communication without the use of electronic componentry of another part of the computer system (col. 5, lines 55-59 and col. 8, lines 19-22). Specifically, flat panel display assembly 2 does not include a telephony chipset. Since flat panel display assembly 2 does not include any electronic componentry for providing wireless communication, wireless handset 14 and flat panel display assembly 2 are not operable to work in combination for providing wireless communication using a telephony chipset of flat panel display assembly 2. In particular, flat panel display assembly 2 is not operable to provide any telephony functionality. Moreover, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a configuration.

In contrast, embodiments of the claimed invention are directed towards a portable electronic device that includes a portable computer system and a communication device removably attached to the portable computer system.

The communication device (e.g., a handset) includes a microphone and a speaker and may be removably attached directly to the portable computer system. The portable computer system includes electronics for wireless communications. In particular, the claimed invention facilitates “an automatic dialing process, based on user input, using said wireless telephone communication device of said portable computer system” (emphasis added).

With reference to the current specification, embodiments of the present invention provide that the handset and the palmtop computer system work in combination to provide wireless communications (page 4, lines 15-20). With reference to Figure 1, a block diagram of components of computer system 100, in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, is shown. Voice handset transmitter/receiver 112 provides a communication link between computer system 100 and a voice handset, such as voice handset 200 of Figure 2A (page 10, lines 13-20).

In order to provide a compact device, the voice handset does not include all electronic componentry to provide wireless communications. Rather, the voice handset uses telephony circuitry (e.g., telephony chipset 111 of Figure 1) to provide wireless communications. Accordingly, the claimed embodiments provide an integrated portable computer system/mobile phone that provides for mobile phone functionality while maintaining the compact size of a portable computer system.

Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik in particular does not teach, disclose, or suggest the invention as claimed. In contrast, Ditzik discloses a modular computer system including a module for storing a wireless handset, in which the computer system does not include a wireless telephone communication device.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Smith fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Smith does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Smith, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Smith to teach an integrated message center. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Smith does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein a communication device and a portable computer device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephony chipset of the portable computer device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Smith does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein the communication device resides in a

communication device housing and is removably attachable directly to a portable computer system housing, as claimed.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik, Smith and Holmström fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Holmström does not overcome the shortcomings of the combination of Ditzik and Smith. Holmström, alone or in combination with Ditzik and Smith, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset and Smith teaches an integrated message center.

Applicants understand Holmström to teach a method and system for selecting communication media. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Holmström does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein a communication device and a portable computer device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephony chipset of the portable computer device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Holmström does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein the communication device resides in a communication device housing and is removably attachable directly to a portable computer system housing, as claimed.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of Ditzik and Holmström, because the teachings of Ditzik teach away from such a combination. Specifically, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a combination.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in Ditzik, Smith and/or Holmström, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 30 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik, Smith and Holmström. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik, Smith and Holmström also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 31-33 that depend from independent Claim 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 31-33 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik in view of Smith, further in view of Holmström, and yet further in view of Lehtonen. Claim 34 depends from independent Claim 30. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the

embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 34 is not anticipated by the combination of Ditzik, Smith, Holmström and Lehtonen in view of the following rationale.

As described above, Ditzik and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants respectfully assert that Ditzik does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device including a portable computer system and a communication device, as claimed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the remarks concerning the rejection of Claims 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for detailed arguments supporting these assertions.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik and Smith fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Smith does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik. Smith, alone or in combination with Ditzik, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset.

Applicants understand Smith to teach an integrated message center. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Smith does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein a communication device and a portable computer device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephony

chipset of the portable computer device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Smith does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein the communication device resides in a communication device housing and is removably attachable directly to a portable computer system housing, as claimed.

Moreover, the combination of Ditzik, Smith and Holmström fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Holmström does not overcome the shortcomings of the combination of Ditzik and Smith. Holmström, alone or in combination with Ditzik and Smith, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset and Smith teaches an integrated message center.

Applicants understand Holmström to teach a method and system for selecting communication media. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Holmström does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein a communication device and a portable computer device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephony chipset of the portable computer device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Holmström does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein the

communication device resides in a communication device housing and is removably attachable directly to a portable computer system housing, as claimed.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of Ditzik and Holmström, because the teachings of Ditzik teach away from such a combination. Specifically, by teaching that telephony functionality is provided using an independently operable wireless handset, Ditzik teaches away from such a combination.

Furthermore, the combination of Ditzik, Smith, Holmström and Lehtonen fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, because Lehtonen does not overcome the shortcomings of Ditzik, Smith and Holmström. Lehtonen, alone or in combination with Ditzik, Smith and Holmström, does not show or suggest the claim embodiments. As described above, Ditzik teaches a modular computer system with a separate module for storing a wireless handset wherein the computer system does not include a telephony chipset, Smith teaches an integrated message center, and Holmström teaches a method and system for selecting communication media.

Applicants understand Lehtonen to teach a double-acting communication device including a display. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic

device wherein a communication device and a portable computer device work in combination to provide the capability for wireless communications with one or more other devices using the telephony chipset of the portable computer device, as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Lehtonen does not teach, describe or suggest a portable electronic device wherein the communication device resides in a communication device housing and is removably attachable directly to a portable computer system housing, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the claim embodiments not being shown or suggested in Ditzik, Smith, Holmström or Lehtonen, either alone or in combination, in combination with the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 30 overcomes the cited references and is therefore allowable over the combination of Ditzik, Smith, Holmström and Lehtonen. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Ditzik, Smith, Holmström and Lehtonen also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 34 that depends from independent Claim 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 34 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and is in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-34 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 7 Mar, 2005



Matthew J. Blecher
Registration No. 46,558

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060